

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1, 3-7, 11-20, 22-25, 31-41 and 59-66 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 20, 61, and 64 are independent. Claims 19 and 38 have been amended. Claims 49-55 and 67-68 have been canceled.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicates that claims 18 and 41 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Fowler & Johnson

Claims 1, 3-4, 11-16, 19-20, 22-25, 34-39 and 59-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of structural features, "wherein said at least one auxiliary display platform is optically connected to

said primary display platform through said at least one hinge.” Independent claim 20 recites a combination of structural features, “wherein said at least one auxiliary display platform is optically connected to said primary display platform through said hinge.” The Examiner admits that Fowler fails to show such an arrangement, since Fowler shows ribbon cables connecting the displays. However, the Examiner asserts that Johnson teaches the optical connection through the hinge.

Applicant acknowledges that Johnson teaches an optical connection adjacent a hinge. However, Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated, or had the skill level, to modify the device of Fowler to include an optical connection through the hinge of Johnson.

Each embodiment of Fowler shows a “ball and socket” connection between the primary display and the secondary display. Indeed, this is the primary object or advantage of the Fowler invention. See col. 1, lines 41-49 and col. 5, lines 33-42. The “ball and socket” connection allows the secondary display to be repositioned relative to the primary display with a plurality of degrees of freedom.

Each embodiment of the Johnson invention shows a linear hinge. Johnson does not have a plurality of degrees of freedom in the movement between the display and the base. Maintaining an alignment between the transmitter and receiver of the optical signals between the base and display is of primary importance to Johnson.

In one embodiment, the receiver housing can only pivot “several degrees either side of vertical and still receive the optical signal.” (col. 2, lines 31-32). In another embodiment, the optical link only “can be maintained over the angle allowed by the aperture 38.” In another embodiment plural transmitter/receivers are employed with a rod lens 50, which creates a linear focal line and permits greater tilting of the display relative to the base. (col. 3, lines 1-14). In a final embodiment, the output of the transmitter is swept over a wide range of angles. In other words, the optical signal is moved around, such that the transmitter “scans possible locations of the detector 32 to acquire a link (i.e. to point the optical signal at the detector).” (col. 3, lines 35-39).

As can be seen in the Johnson reference, it is difficult and/or costly to maintain a optical connection between a base and a display, where the display can be tilted relative to the base (with one degree of freedom). Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to adapt the optical communication link taught by Johnson to the system shown by Fowler. Fowler has multiple degrees of freedom between the primary display and the secondary display. Therefore, the optical communication embodiments taught by Johnson, dealing with simple tilting between a display relative to a base, would not function with the “ball and socket” hinges of Fowler.

Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have replaced the “ball and socket” hinges of the Fowler

invention with the linear hinges taught by Johnson. Fowler directly states “It is a further object of the invention to provide an improved viewing screen, rotatable within a plurality of degrees of freedom with respect to a base.” (col. 1, lines 41-43). It would destroy an object of Fowler’s invention to replace the ball and socket connections with linear hinges, because the display would no longer be “rotatable within a plurality of degrees of freedom.” Hence, Fowler teaches away from any such modification, and when a reference teaches away from a modification, such a modification would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 4 and 23

The Examiner asserts that Fowler shows the auxiliary display covering all of the primary display in Fowler’s Figure 11. It is true that Fowler’s Figure 11 shows the primary display covering all of the auxiliary display. However, the embodiment of Fowler’s Figure 11 fails to meet the other limitations of independent claims 1 and 20, which recited at least one hinge “rotatably connecting said at least one auxiliary display platform to said primary display platform, **such that said at least one auxiliary display platform can be operated at a variety of angles relative to said primary display platform.**” In Figure 11, the primary display and auxiliary display move relative to each other in parallel planes. The auxiliary display cannot be operated at a variety of angles relative to the primary display.

It is impermissible to arbitrarily pick various features from various alternative embodiments within one reference. There must be some reasoning, within the 103 obviousness standards, for creating a hybrid embodiment. The Examiner has not provided the rational to modify Fowler to piece together features from the various embodiments.

Re Claims 11-12, 14-16, 34-35 and 37-39

Claims 11-12, 14-16, 34-35 and 37-39 recite either a vertically or horizontally directed hinge. Fowler's hinge is a "ball and socket" type hinge. Such a hinge cannot be fairly characterized as a vertically directed hinge, nor a horizontally directed hinge. Moreover, as discussed above, it would not be obvious to replace the "ball and socket" type hinge with a horizontally or vertically directed hinge, as such a replacement is directly taught away from by Fowler, and would destroy an objective and disclosed advantage of Fowler's invention.

Claims 19 and 24

Neither Fowler, nor Johnson, address inhibiting overlapping of images displayed on the primary and auxiliary displays. Therefore, the combination of Fowler and Johnson could not show or suggest Applicant's claims 19 and 24. Please cite any relevant disclosure in Fowler or Johnson.

Claim 25

Neither Fowler, nor Johnson, address any “computer generated program which maximizes an amount of available space for one or more images to be displayed on said primary display platform and said at least one auxiliary display platform without allowing for an overlapping between any of said displayed images.” Therefore, the combination of Fowler and Johnson could not show or suggest Applicant’s claim 25. Please cite any relevant disclosure in Fowler or Johnson.

Claims 59 and 60

Neither Fowler, nor Johnson, address “a motor for selectively rotating said at least one auxiliary display platform relative to said primary display platform between an open position and a closed position.” Therefore, the combination of Fowler and Johnson could not show or suggest Applicant’s claims 59 and 60. Please cite any relevant disclosure in Fowler or Johnson.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Fowler & Mizoguchi

Claims 61-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Mizoguchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Fowler lacks a motor.

Mizoguchi shows a motor for raising or lowering a display relative to a stand or desktop. There is no showing or teaching in Mizoguchi to selectively rotate at least one auxiliary display relative to a primary display.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings of Mizoguchi with the display system of Fowler. Mizoguchi teaches linear movement using a toothed track. Such a system would not be adaptable to the “ball and socket” hinge, located between the displays of Fowler. How could the toothed track of Mizoguchi be used to “rotate” one display platform relative to another display platform, between an opened and closed position?

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Fowler, Johnson & Ohgami

Claims 5-7 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson in view of Ohgami. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-7 and 31-33 depend either directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 20. Ohgami has been cited as a teaching reference for an activation/deactivation mechanism. However, Ohgami fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary references of Fowler and Johnson, as discussed above regarding claims 1 and 20.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Fowler, Johnson & Gouko

Claims 17 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson in view of Gouko. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 40 depend either directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 20. Gouko has been cited as a teaching reference for a fourth auxiliary display platform. However, Gouko fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary references of Fowler and Johnson, as discussed above regarding claims 1 and 20.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Fowler, Grever & Cowart

Claims 49-55 and 67-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Grever in view of Cowart. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 49-55 and 67-68 have been canceled. Therefore, this rejection has been rendered moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 - Fowler, Johnson & Mizoguchi

Claims 59 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson in view of Mizoguchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 59 and 60 depend directly from independent claims 1 and 20, respectively. Since, Mizoguchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Fowler and

Johnson regarding independent claims 1 and 20, claims 59 and 60 should be considered allowable.

Moreover, the Examiner admits that Fowler lacks a motor.

Mizoguchi shows a motor for raising or lowering a display relative to a stand or desktop. There is no showing or teaching in Mizoguchi to selectively rotate at least one auxiliary display relative to a primary display.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the teachings of Mizoguchi with the display system of Fowler. Mizoguchi teaches linear movement using a toothed track. Such a system would not be adaptable to the “ball and socket” hinge, located between the displays of Fowler. How could the toothed track of Mizoguchi be used to “rotate” one display platform relative to another display platform, between an opened and closed position?

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one month extension of time in which to respond to the


Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mr. Scott L. Lowe (Reg. No. 41,458) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1602 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Scott L. Lowe
Registration No. 41,458

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

SLL:lmh